

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 16-22, 38-44, 60-66 and 82-88 are pending in the application. Claims 16, 38, 60, and 82 are amended, no claims are cancelled, and no claims are added. The amendments to the claims as indicated herein do not add any new matter to this application. Furthermore, amendments made to the claims as indicated herein have been made to exclusively improve readability and clarity of the claims and not for the purpose of overcoming alleged prior art.

I. ISSUES NOT RELATING TO PRIOR ART – CLAIMS 16, 38, 60, 82 - 35 U.S.C. § 112, SECOND PARAGRAPH

Claims 16, 38, 60 and 82 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. Claims 16, 38, 60, and 82 now recite “the SNMP GET request.” Thus, the rejection of claims 16, 38, 60, and 82 made under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph has been fully addressed and overcome. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. ISSUES RELATING TO PRIOR ART

A. CLAIMS 16, 19, 38, 41, 60, 63, 82 and 85 – Narayan

Claims 16, 19, 38, 41, 60, 63, 82 and 85 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by *Narayan, et al.*, U.S. Pat. No. 7,010,782. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 16, 38, 60, and 82 each feature “*receiving, from a requester that stores an incorrect attribute value for an SNMP MIB object and that is unable to read and write the SNMP MIB object directly and that does not have a correct value for the SNMP MIB object, a SNMP*

GET request identifying an SNMP MIB object and also containing one or more non-null values comprising proposals for a correct value of the SNMP MIB object, wherein the SNMP GET request requests a determination as to whether any of the one or more values match the correct value stored in the SNMP MIB object of the managed device;" Narayan fails to provide the quoted feature, and therefore the rejection is overcome.

An embodiment of the claimed approach allows re-synchronizing information to be shared between a requester and an SNMP object for proper communication to take place when configuration is changed on the SNMP object and the corresponding updates are not communicated to the requester. For example, a lack of agreement on information on attribute value such as telnet user name/password or community strings could prevent a connection from being established between the requester and an SNMP object. In this situation, the ability to perform direct SNMP GETs and SETs cannot be used to obtain the correct value of a MIB object.

In contrast, *Narayan's* test system relies on SNMP commands that read and write values in the MIB (col. 3, lines 61-66). It assumes the ability to change the value of the community string (col. 8, lines 32-38), which might be reasonable in a testing environment, but not acceptable in a live operating environment due to security threats. *Narayan* provides no way for a requester, having an incorrect attribute value for a MIB object and unable to read/write the object and lacking a correct value for the object, to propose a value for the object and learn if the proposed is correct as claimed.

Applicant has identified features of the Claims 16, 38, 60, and 82 that are missing in the reference, and therefore, the claims are not anticipated. Furthermore, each of Claims 19, 41, 63, and 85 directly depends on Claims 16, 38, 60, and 82 respectively, and as such, also includes the

distinguishing features that are missing in the reference. In addition, each of Claims 19, 41, 63, and 85 introduces one or more additional features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite the positive resolution of this case, a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 19, 41, 63, and 85 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 16, 38, 60, and 82. Therefore, each of Claims 16, 19, 38, 41, 60, 63, 82 and 85 are still patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over *Narayan*. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

B. CLAIMS 16, 18, 21, 22, 38, 40, 43, 44, 60, 62, 65, 66, 82, 84, 87 and 88 -

GROVER

Claims 16, 18, 21, 22, 38, 40, 43, 44, 60, 62, 65, 66, 82, 84, 87 and 88 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by *Grover, et al.*, U.S. Pat. No. 5,737,518. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Each of the rejected claims recites, directly or indirectly by dependency on another claim, “receiving, from a requester that stores an incorrect attribute value for an SNMP MIB object and that is unable to read and write the SNMP MIB object directly and that does not have a correct value for the SNMP MIB object, a SNMP GET request identifying an SNMP MIB object and also containing one or more non-null values comprising proposals for a correct value of the SNMP MIB object, wherein the SNMP GET request requests a determination as to whether any of the one or more values match the correct value stored in the SNMP MIB object of the managed device.” Grover fails to provide the quoted feature, and therefore, the rejection is overcome.

Grover's test system is configured by the user. The test system is configured to have the correct value so as to be able to test whether the correct response is returned. The purpose of *Grover's* approach is to verify that the device under test is working as expected. In contrast, in the claimed approach, the requester does not have the correct value and needs to learn whether any of the proposed attribute values is the correct attribute value. The requester, alone, is unable to verify correctness. *Grover* assumes the use of a management station that has the capability to read and write information in a device under test's MIB (col. 6, lines 30-42). The requester in the claimed approach lacks that capability.

The applicant has identified multiple features of the claims that are missing in the reference, and therefore, the claims are not anticipated. Each of Claims 16, 38, 60, and 82 includes distinguishing features that are missing in the reference. Furthermore, Claims 18, 21, 22, 40, 43, 44, 62, 65, 66, 84, 87 and 88 depend directly or indirectly on Claims 16, 38, 60, and 82 and thus include the distinguishing features that are missing in the reference.

In addition, each of Claims 18, 21, 22, 40, 43, 44, 62, 65, 66, 84, 87, and 88 introduces one or more additional features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite the positive resolution of this case, a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. It is respectfully submitted that Claims 18, 21, 22, 40, 43, 44, 62, 65, 66, 84, 87 and 88 are allowable for the reasons given above with respect to Claims 16, 38, 60, and 82. Therefore, the each of Claims 16, 18, 21, 22, 38, 40, 43, 44, 60, 62, 65, 66, 82, 84, 87 and 88 are still patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over *Grover*. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

C. CLAIM 17 – GROVER AND CHISHOLM

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over *Grover, et al.*, U.S. Pat No. 5,737,518 in view of *Chisholm* U.S. Pat. No. 6,697,970. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 17 depends upon the independent Claim 16. Therefore, Claim 17 includes each and every feature of the independent base claim which is patentable over *Grover* for the reasons explained above. *Chisholm* does not disclose the features of Claim 16 missing in *Grover* as argued above. Therefore, Claim 17 is patentable over the combination of *Grover and Chisholm*.

In addition, Claim 17 introduces one or more additional features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite the positive resolution of this case, a separate discussion of those features in not included at this time. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

D. CLAIMS 20, 42, 64 and 86 – GROVER AND KWAN

Claims 20, 42, 64 and 86 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Grover, et al.*, U.S. Pat No. 5,737,518 in view of *WhitePaper: IronShield Best Practices Hardening Foundry Routers & Switches to Kwan*. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 20, 42, 64, and 86 are dependent on claims 16, 38, 60, and 82 respectively. Therefore, each of Claims 20, 42, 64, and 86 includes the same distinguishing features as their corresponding independent claims which is patentable over *Grover*. *WhitePaper: IronShield Best Practices Hardening Foundry Routers & Switches to Kwan* does not disclose the distinguishing features of Claims 16, 38, 60, and 82 that are missing in *Grover* as argued above.

Therefore, Claims 20, 42, 64, and 86 are patentable over the combination of *Grover and WhitePaper: IronShield Best Practices Hardening Foundry Routers & Switches to Kwan*.

In addition, each of Claims 20, 42, 64, and 86 introduces one or more additional features that independently render the claim patentable. However, due to the fundamental differences already identified, and to expedite the positive resolution of this case, a separate discussion of those features is not included at this time. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Therefore, the issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance is believed next in order, and that action is most earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is believed that such contact would further the examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136 is hereby made to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed. Please charge any applicable fee that is missing or insufficient to Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,

Hickman Palermo Truong & Becker LLP

Dated: April 22, 2008

/Deborah L. Caswell#61,766/
Patent Agent, Deborah L. Caswell
Reg. No. 61,766

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550
San Jose, California 95110-1089
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1455
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076